

REMARKS

Claims 9-16 were pending at the time of the Office Action. In this Amendment, claims 9 and 11 have been amended to clarify an aspect of the invention and claims 13-16 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter. Support is found in, original claims and paragraphs [0042]-[0043] and [0048]-[0050] of the application-as-published, US 2007/0171153 A1. Claims 9, 11 and 12 are currently pending for examination, of which claim 9 is independent. Care has been exercised not to introduce new matter.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 9, 13-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Tamaki et al. (US 2003/0122750 A1, hereinafter “Tamaki”). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Amended claim 9, in pertinent part, recites “said control arrangement changes, according to the number of said drive lines to be connected to said drive current source, the resistance of said second transistor corresponding to said scanning lines connected to said second potential to become an unselected state.” As disclosed in FIGS. 1 and 2, illustrating one example of what is recited in claim 9, the control unit 8 reads the voltage data VGSx from the memory unit 8a in accordance with the numbers (x) of the pixels to luminesce on the selected scanning lines S1~Sn, and outputs the drive signals based on the read voltage data VGS1~VGSn to the transistors Tr2 of the scanning switches 21~2m corresponding to the unselected scanning lines S1~Sm. When the number of pixels to luminesce on the scanning lines S2 is one, the drive signal based on the voltage data VGS1 is outputted the transistor Tr2 of the scanning switches 21 and 23~2m corresponding to the unselected scanning lines S1, S3~Sm. When the voltage data VGS1 is inputted to the gate of the transistor Tr2 of the scanning switches 21 and 23~2m corresponding to

the unselected scanning lines S1, S3~Sm, the resistance of the second transistors Tr2 of the scanning switches 21 and 23~2m corresponding to the unselected scanning lines S1, S3~Sm changes correspondingly. Since the read voltage data VGS1~VGn are provided to the transistors Tr2 of the scanning switches corresponding to the unselected scanning lines, the dispersion in the luminous brightness is reduced.

Tamaki fails to disclose the above limitations of claim 9 regarding “said control arrangement changes, according to the number of said drive lines to be connected to said drive current source, the resistance of said second transistor corresponding to said scanning lines connected to said second potential to become an unselected state.”

Turning to Tamaki, the voltage (output of the NOR gate 181) inputted to the gate of pMOS transistor 182, which corresponds to the “second transistor” of claim 9, does not change when the scanning lines corresponding the pMOS transistor 182 are not selected. Thus, Tamaki’s pMOS transistor 182 (second transistor) does not change its resistance by changing the voltage inputted to its gate when the scanning lines corresponding to the electrode output circuits 180-1 are not selected. Since the resistance of the pMOS transistor 182 are not changed, unwanted currents flow through unselected pixels. Thus, Tamaki’s OLED has drawbacks of dispersion in brightness. That is, the brightness of a selected pixel when some of pixels including the selected pixel are turned becomes lower than that of the selected pixel when all of pixels including the selected pixel are turned on. In contrast, claim 9 requires “said control arrangement” to “change[s], according to the number of said drive lines to be connected to said drive current source, the resistance of said second transistor corresponding to said scanning lines connected to said second potential to become an unselected state.” Since the read voltage data VGS1~VGn are provided to even the transistors Tr2 of the scanning switches corresponding to

the unselected scanning lines, the current flowing through the unselected pixels becomes reduced and therefore the dispersion in the luminous brightness becomes reduced.

As anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each element of the claim in issue be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference, *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 USPQ 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983), based on the foregoing, it is submitted that Tamaki does not anticipate claim 9. Thus, claim 9 and claims dependent thereupon have novelty over Tamaki.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 12 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamaki in view of Muruyama et al. (US 2004/0061670 A1, hereinafter “Muruyama”). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As addressed above, Tamaki fails to disclose the limitations of claim 9 regarding “said control arrangement changes, according to the number of said drive lines to be connected to said drive current source, the resistance of said second transistor corresponding to said scanning lines connected to said second potential to become an unselected state.”

In addition, Muruyama, which was cited for temperature detecting means, fails to cure deficiencies of Tamaki.

Accordingly, as each and every limitation must be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art references in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness (*see*, M.P.E.P. § 2143.03) and for at least the foregoing reasons the proposed combination of Tamaki and Muruyama fails to do so, it is respectfully submitted claim 12 dependent upon and including all limitations of claim 9 is patentable over the combination of Tamaki and Muruyama.

Claim 15 has been canceled. Therefore, the rejection with respect to claim 15 is rendered moot.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Hosang Lee
Limited Recognition No. L00,295

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB/HL
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: March 20, 2009

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**